Èxaminer-Initiated Interview Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	10/024,869	ZIMMER ET AL.
	Examiner	Art Unit
	Steven D. Maki	1733
All Participants:	Status of Application:	_
(1) <u>Steven D. Maki</u> .	(3)	
(2) <u>Richard O'Planick</u> .	(4)	
Date of Interview: <u>19 April 2006</u>	Time:	
Type of Interview:  ☐ Telephonic ☐ Video Conference ☐ Personal (Copy given to: ☐ Applicant ☐ Applicant's representative)  Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated: ☐ Yes ☐ No If Yes, provide a brief description:		
Part I.		
Rejection(s) discussed:		
Claims discussed: 1, 16, 17		
Prior art documents discussed: art of record		
Part II.		
SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENERAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS DISCUSSED: See Continuation Sheet		
Part III.		
<ul> <li>□ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview directly resulted in the allowance of the application. The examiner will provide a written summary of the substance of the interview in the Notice of Allowability.</li> <li>☑ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summary by the examiner appears in Part II above.</li> </ul>		
Δ		
Here & Mali		
(Examiner/SPE Signature) (Applicant/	Applicant's Representative Sig	nature – if appropriate)



Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was discussed: On 4-19-06, examiner proposed amending claims 1, 16, and 17 to include allowable subject matter. In particular, examiner proposed making the following amendment: In claim 1 line 8, after "the second side (2')" insert --having a convex surface extending from and--. Examiner noted that support is found in figure 3 and paragraph 26 on page 4 of the specification. Examiner commented that the prior art suggests concave instead of convex. On 4-20-06, applicant's representative informed examiner that the proposal is not acceptable.